Segregation:

Blacks lived in the South and disproportionally went into blue collar work. If you wanted to make top dollar, you needed to live in the Northeast. Because the blacks earned half as much as whites, they could not fund their schools properly to go to college where only 1/3rd of black people when to college at that time. This was negative because blacks revenues were down meaning their schools were much less funded than white schools, blacks could not invest enough in their own people. Blacks living in the South did not go up North (becoming stockbrokers, starting their own companies, bankers etc.) after slavery instead choosing to stay with plantations and buy their own lands. Not that it mattered; their schools were still poorly funded. There was no double standard as well. It should be noted that if the black percentage in states like Alabama were below 5%, there would be no reason for segregation, and they probably would not have done it.

In 1960, the unemployment rate among young black men was only 8% (as compared to 5% nationwide). Shouldn't the situation have been far worse in 1960 - a time in history that was closer to institutionalized discrimination and slavery than 2015? If favoritism is so bad in America, wouldn't blacks in Africa be doing worse in their fields of work on average than blacks in America given that Africa is much poorer?

The blacks wanted integration thinking that if by going into the white schools, they would get a better standard of living. The blacks also sided with the Socialists (talmudists in America at that time/SU) because they were blue collar workers thinking that there was something in it for them in the country turned communist. This got them hated by almost all whites. Blacks also wanted equal representation when it came to members of governments. They were getting cheated (part is wrong) in voting because the blacks who could barely read or write could not vote while the whites could. No doubt that many more were cheated through unrealistic voting standards in one or two states.

Anti- Miscegenation Laws lasted until 1967 in twelve states. Many people all of races preferred these laws. The Native Americans favored these laws knowing that they would be bred out of existence if not for them. Whites in South Africa would now prefer segregation. Because of integration, it is easier to deny whites land and it is also easier to discriminate/ attack them because of their race because groups of people do it rather than one small

group inside of South Africa. You don't have to join an extremist group to discriminate now.

I want to show this to the black people reading this because they compare the protestors who were in favor of keeping segregation in the same class as the Rodney King cops. I am telling you those two events are in no way comparable. Many people who were there during them are ashamed to talk about this; they were worried their country would fall to the Soviet Union because of black people. During these times, people did not want an enemy at home. They had one right in Cuba, if they thought you were going to side with Cuba and overthrow the US government, you were not safe. I know you will think I'm calling you out, but you care about America I know this, these people cared too whether you agree or not is perfectly fine. All I'm asking is that you leave it behind maybe you can go talk to one of them. We don't have to fund a Back to Africa project, we can work this out. This is your country too; you should feel welcome in America maybe that person who protested could relate to you because you both want what is best for America you just have different means of achieving the same goal. Just know that we won't cater to one race, for this to work, we have to cater to all legal immigrants so you get the opportunity that society deems best. I'm not going to try to relate to you. I'm not going to say if you are being fair or not, let's just work together without insulting or questioning one another that way I know you want to make this work because I value your opinion too I read your posts. I might disagree strongly with you, but you are still fair. If you don't want my advice and you only want black votes to count, that is also fair. It's not that I want to help you; it's that I want a ceasefire; I think we both can move past asking if someone is doing something because of the color of their skin. If we can work past that, than you can begin to listen to those Trump supporters who disagree with you without getting angry. I can listen to you then if one of them pisses you off rather than thinking both parties are at fault, you both look dumb for arguing, I've been there. This also relates to me because I have not closed the door yet on you, I want your support. I would rather teach you this material, not for your own good but rather to show you that I won't lie if somebody asked me if the slave abolitions groups did as rebels, you can paint them as heroes, I won't for two reasons. One you don't know if they did it to gain a stronghold, two they really thought they knew more than the state, I haven't read too far into it to know their intent, I need letters from them, this was few and far between. Regardless, I still respect his efforts from John Brown.

Notice how short this "rebuttal" is, you can take 20% of it and learn from it and I would still be satisfied with you.

You need to decide what is tolerable and what intolerable. For example, I tolerate someone holding up a "black supremacist" sign now while I disagree with it 100%, they at least can talk to me and explain why they feel it is necessary. I can work with these people in public; I have no intentions of kicking them out. Another thing too is that you can get angry at a "white nationalist" the reality is that black and white nationalists got along, the KKK and the "neo Nazi" movement in America worked with NOI. If they really think black people should be deported, it has nothing to do with your skin color; they would shut up if they saw that crime rates went down. You and I both know that skin color has nothing to do with crime rates.... I cannot sign off on that only because basketball players are black, either it is from slave ancestors or something else. I bring this up because the streets are voluntary, they can just go home. There's no reason for you to go on the internet and say "**** you" to one of these people. At the end of the day, these people are tolerant of you, they don't hate you at all its society they hate. I'm not siding with you at all; this is just to make you better aware of your environment. There's no proof these people are out to get you, I have met people who are actually rude; these people are not. I'm making the case to you that most people are so good at heart; you just don't give them a chance.

I am quoting a black person I had seen on TV since I do not get involved; he said that inner city blacks grow up thinking their government is against them. I can't tell them what to do but thank those who did not talk about the news daily and left their kids out of it. If you notice, I don't post crime statistics on the internet, I did not judge. What you define as "racism" is really hostility. Not everyone will trust you, everyone's parents are trying; they want you to get along with others. You are smart enough to know that many people vote a certain way, I don't expect you to agree with me. I don't need to find others who support me.

"Segregation forever" George Wallace

For people who are mad at George Wallace for this speech:

1. He was mad about government overstepping their bounds, not black people going to the same universities as whites. George did not care if there were integrated colleges in Alabama as long as they were not state owned.
2. He did not care if schools in other states were segregated or not
3. He fought against National Socialist Germany in WW2 on the belief he was fighting white Supremacy.
4. He never said anything racist or derogatory against black people.
5. He made sure that the protests for integration were peaceful and that the police would not beat blacks with clubs
6. George later in life admitted that he made a big mistake with the speech. He did not write the words.

KKK

1st Clan (1865-1877)

Est. killed 1,200 blacks / 300 whites by Tuskegee Institute figures

Hundreds killed----History Channel

We are unsure if blacks were killed during a gang fight when someone took out a knife or if someone was killed for wanting integration and claimed to be part of the KKK. We are also unsure if KKK lynching's ever happened because it carried the death penalty. Notice how 300 whites were killed, this implies that blacks were not targeted for "minding their own business." if anything, those blacks were left alone since they posed no threat.

2nd Clan (1915-1944)

Est. Killed 416

Membership anywhere from 3-6 million. That's about 13 deaths per year.

3rd Klan (1954-1968)

There probably was not a Klan during this time. It totals to 15 killed during the integration protests.

The purpose of this is to show that the KKK did not recruit people to kill. First, people would get a threading letter, and then they would get whipped if they continued their actions. Attacks or murders were set out by the most

extreme members who were not getting the message. We also don't know if the figures are an exaggeration or not. The point I'm trying to get across is that this movement was far overstated. It came out of fear and uncertainty because the federal government was now in charge of the South. This was before the Jim Crow Laws. I do not support their actions in any way. Using fear to get a message across is wrong. But even worse, the South African Boer farmers (whites) are four times more likely to be murdered. No media coverage for that. Maybe the people murdering them will exceed the KKK's numbers if it hasn't already.

There is no such thing as a "racist" leader. At no point in history were there racists running for office. It would have looked off if the person who was installed in Cuba was in love with his Texas homeland. Granted this man would be relatable to the American public, but never would it be an American living in Cuba or worse, an American sent to Cuba. If you want to run the world, you do not run foreign people, they do not like that. A true at heart racist would hate all other countries for not doing exactly what he wanted. There will always be shared interest, but never full. No leader has ever looked for complete hegemony. I'm referencing Fulgencio Batista. This relates to blacks in America, the simple response was, "you are not my problem" during those times. There was not favoritism; that is the wrong word; the blacks were left alone. I say this because you still have independence if someone is not deliberately out to get you or is favoring another group. Referencing the Jim Crow Laws or segregation is unnecessary. How do we know? Blacks and the Irish were able to buy their freedom back in the 16th century. You would have to argue that racism (as favoritism) came back at some point. If the people who are being ignored by society are not accepted, it happens out of fear. In the Roman Empire, blacks were embraced as one of their own but the Germanic people were not. Neither you nor I should be expected to accept each other. At no point was there ever any discrimination in American history, some will boldly disagree with me and I accept this.

American Civil War:

The American flag is racist by your definition as it fought against the British who were freeing slaves during the American Revolution. Would you also like the American flag banned? The British ended slavery in 1807, it took

over 60 years later with the excuse of a civil war to get the Americans to abolish it. Your depiction of slavery is also backwards. The British didn't have actual slaves; they just bought them from tribes in Africa. There was also an easy path to becoming free but that is beside the point. There were hardly any slaves if at all during 1780 in Britain because slaves only did work in agriculture and there was no need for slaves given that the British underwent an industrial revolution first in 1780 and they obviously promoted slaves to work in industry. Slavery was unnecessary because industry replaced the need for slaves instead of working in a plantation, you would work in a factory. Depending on your strength or knowledge, you would be assigned to a certain factory that fit your ability. Slavery also meant that you had to pay for a slaves housing, food, and health which meant you were better off not paying for these costs and having an employee instead.